

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/221,534**

Applicant(s)  
**Pastryk et al**

Examiner  
**William Tapolcai**

Group Art Unit  
**3744**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William Tapolcai (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Joel Van Winkle (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 22, 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

cited, of record, especially Gould and Buchser

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was pointed out that Gould does not have a freezer compartment and a freezer door on which the ice bin is mounted. However, other patents such as Horvay '383 do have a freezer door with an ice bin mounted thereon. it was also pointed out that several problems would occur in trying to mount the prior art auger such as taught in Buchser in a bin that is mounted on a freezer door. For example, wiring, spacing location of the motor and auger, and the weight of the motor and auger on the door are some of the problems. Thus, it was agreed that nothing directly in Buchser would lead one skilled in the art to solve these problems by combining an ice auger with a bin mounted on a freezer door. Moreover, the problems discussed above would lead one skilled in the art away from combining and Buchser with a bin mounted on a freezer door.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

*W. E. Tapolcai*  
William E. Tapolcai  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 344